VISITOR BEHAVIOR

Summer 1987

CURRENT TRENDS IN AUDIENCE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

The American Association of Museums Evaluation and Research Committee published a summary of ten studies presented in a poster session at the 1987 AAM meeting in San Francisco. The titles and authors of these papers are listed below.

• "A Study of the Curriculum Found in Exhibitions at Ten Museums in Southern California" by Valorie Beer, Xerox Corporation.

• "Using Kids and Commercial Product Analysis for Front End Audience Input in Exhibit Development" by Linda A. Black, Children's Museum of Indianapolis. • "An Investigation of 'The Renoir Influence'" by Clementine Brown, Museum of Fine Arts in Boton. • "Using Computer Stations to Survey Visitors" by Julie Graber, Center of Science and Industry, Columbus, OH. • "Visitor Behavior in an Exhibition Before and After Inclusion of a Computerized Unit" by D.D. Hilke, Betsy Hennings, & Myriam Springuel, Smithsonian Institution. • "Designing an Evalulation Study for 'The Machine Age 1918-1941" by Gerard Le Francois, Sonnet Takahisa, Brooklyn Museum, & George Hein, Lesley College. • "Can Experienced Museum Visitors be Models for Art Novices?" by Melora McDermott, Denver Art Museum. • "Designing Exhibit Labels from Experimental Research" by Steve Bitgood, Grant Nichols, & Don Patterson, Jacksonville State University, and Michael Pierce & Pete Conroy, Anniston Museum of Natural

• "Evaluation of a Living History Program" by Lois Silverman, Pennsbury Manor.

History.

• "How Does the Garden Grow? Researching the Community" by Jane Sokolow & Elizabeth Molinari, New York Botanical Garden, and Susan Greenstein, Kellogg Museum Project.

Limited copies of this report are available for \$4.00, the cost of binding, handling, and mailing (\$2.00 to AAM Evaluation and Research Committee and \$2.00 for postage and handling costs at Jacksonville State University). Requests should be sent to Psychology Institute, P. O. Box 3090, Jacksonville State University, Jacksonville, AL 36265. No purchase orders please!

Subscription Increase for Volume III

In order to cover the cost of publishing <u>Visitor</u> <u>Behavior</u>, subscription rates will increase from \$6.00 to \$8.00 beginning with Volume III.

POST-OCCUPANCY EVALUATION: A PROCESS MODEL

From Wolfgang, Preiser & Richard Pugh (1986). A Process Description of Literature Evaluation, Walkthrough Post-Occupancy Evaluations, A Generic Program and Design for the City of Albuquerque. <u>Proceedings of the</u> <u>1986 Environmental Design Research</u> <u>Association</u>. pp. 231-240.

Post-Occupancy Evaluation (POE) is a common evaluation technique in architecture. O'Reilly, Shettel-Neuber, and Vining (1981) and Shettel-Neuber (1985) applied this technique to exhibition facilities. Although Preiser and Pugh's paper did not deal with visitor behavior, I believe it offers a useful model of evaluation for exhibition centers. Preiser and Pugh's POE process model stresses the importance of making evaluation criteria explicit and involves three levels.

Level I: Indicative POE

This level is the initial level. It usually involves a walk-through of the facility and it relies on the knowledge and skills of the evaluator(s). Results are focused on problem identification. Compared to the other two levels, it requires little time and effort.

Level II: Investigative POE

When an indicative POE has identified issues that require further study, an investigative POE may be initiated. Its results are focused on short-term problem solving and recommendations that do not require major construction. Considerably more time and personnel are usually required than for an indicative POE.

Level III: Diagnostic POE

This level requires multi-method approaches (e.g., interviews, surveys, observations, physical measurements). Since it is diagnostic in nature its results are oriented toward long-term, state of the art improvements. It requires greater resources than for levels I and II.

This process model of POE always starts with an indicative POE and proceeds toward a diagnostic POE as the need arises. Preiser and Pugh make a distinction between "building diagnostics" and "post-occupancy evaluation". "Building diagnostics" is a broader term that includes all aspects of building performance during all phases of the building process. "Post-occupancy evaluation" focuses on the evaluation of building performance after a building has been occupied for some time.